## 

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,	) Case No. CR 16 - Cr - 132 - CRB
Plaintiff, v.	) STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
Charles Burns  Defendant.	
For the reasons stated by the parties on the reconspeedy Trial Act from April 7, 2016 to by the continuance outweigh the best interest of	ard on April 7, 2016, the Court excludes time under the police and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):
Failure to grant a continuance we See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i)	ould be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of to or law, that it is unreasonable to	replex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial polished by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	ould deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, of due diligence. <i>See</i> 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	ould unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
the state of the s	ould unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time on, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.  v).
IT IS SO ORDERED.	APR 07 2016
DATED: <u>4-7-16</u>	SALLIE KIM United States Magistrate Judge  susan Y. Soong clerk, U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORN
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney